

SPF-SIG Committee Meeting Minutes
May 12, 2010, 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Location: ODADAS. 280 N. High Street, Columbus, Ohio

Telephone conference and members attending in person

Members Present:

Angela Cornelius Dawson	Brad Williams	John Bohley
Ruth Satterfield	Carlos Ramos	Kathie Chaffee
Sandy Starr	Cathy Sperling	Sgt Cheryl Danielson
Dawn Thomas	Elaine Georgas	Yvonne Jordan
Sarah Ndiangui	Greg Jefferson	Michael Coyne
Nicholas Martt	Janet Chandler	Phil Atkins
Eloise Traina		

Members Absent:

Maj Alexander Alston	Rod Woods	Jan Stine
Frank Porter	Michael Langford	Shandell Jamal
Janet Groome	Mollie Stevens	Stacey Gibson
Kathy Coate Ortiz	Patricia Harmon	Terry Koons
LtC David Seitz	Robert Smedley	Tonia Gray
Wendy Vaughn Hunter		

Welcome:

Ruth Satterfield: Announced there had been a change in directions for the telephone conference sent via e-mail. Announced Director Cornelius Dawson was not present but would be joining the conference shortly. Conducted a roll call of members. Apologized to Elaine Georgas for the late sending of the information.

Judy Mosely (ODH) will no longer be able to attend the committee meetings. Judy was told she would be missed and could return at any time. Jan Stine (ODH) will be able to attend the meetings.

There are some members who are traveling and will try to come into the conference. If they come on the call Ruth will stop and ask them to identify themselves.

You should have received copies of draft minutes of the 4-22-10 meeting, agenda for today's meeting, a list of acronyms, checklist for SPF SIG Strategic Plan (sent on 4-10-10), a piece of the Strategic Plan, section 1.1 (sent on 5-5-10), and a sample of SPF SIG criteria from other states.

We are going to start the conversation with the SPF SIG criteria from other states. This will be the majority of the conversation. There is a lot to think about and hash through to help the members feel comfortable about this.

Minutes:

Minutes were discussed and approved with one change: Move Janet Groome from the absent list to the present list.

1,1, 3.1 and 4.3 - Reviewed and approved.

Ruth Satterfield: Look at the pieces that we sent out. 1.1, 3.1 and 4.3 – only received one set of comments. It will be assumed if there is no feedback that they are acceptable as sent. Comment: A couple of typos: CVD should be spelled out, and “an” that becomes an “a.” Acceptable to group and same to be corrected.

Conversation: email with questions from John Bohley

John Bohley's questions sent in an email (5-11-10). “... the needing but not receiving treatment graphs provide those in need but not receiving treatment as percentages of general population and not percentages of persons in need. If that's the case, perhaps that could be stated in the explanatory remarks.

Sandy Star: I did some backtracking to see how they came up with those numbers. People with diagnosis, yes; treatment, no; divided by state population for those above 12 years of age.

Sandy Starr: Added description to web site. Is this sufficient or need more information.

John Bohley: That is sufficient.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: In speaking with the Director of ONDCP; 1 in 10 people who need treatment have access to treatment and probably funds only serve 100,000; the 1 in 10 is continuously repeated.

Federal agencies across Federal agencies see that picture as well. When we were doing our calculations and backing into those calculations, they were actually very close to the NDSUH survey.

I was on a conference call with ONDCP and substance abuse directors across the country. As it relates to ONDCP, the word “prevention” is followed by treatment. Clearly what is happening is not a war on drugs, but getting people access to prevention and treatment. I encourage everyone to read that strategy so you can see how the Department is going.

John Bohley’s Question No. 2 (from his 5-11-10 email): The heavy drinking among adults graph references the U.S. Dietary Guidelines. This reference may not be accurate.

Nick Martt: I removed that part from the web site as it was not clear. Removed reference to the USDA. Definition has been changed.

John Bohley’s question number 3 (from 5-11-10 email): First Use of Marijuana by Age in Ohio graph. Is it providing percentages of people who first used when they were 12-17, or 18-25, or 26+ years old?

Sandy Starr: The graph reflects the person’s age at the time of the interview and not the age at first use. We went back and clarified the definition. It is good to have a second set of eyes on the data.

Kathie Chaffee: Binge drinking regarding definition of terms. We should all know what we are talking about. For example, binge – 4 or more for women, and 5 or more for men.

Ruth Satterfield: Do we want to make that distinction? We can have Nick look into and see how the information was presented and make sure that it was presented clearly.

Group agreed to need for clarification.

Discussion: SPF SIG criteria from other states.

Ruth Satterfield: Now we need to think In terms of Ohio, how are we going to set up our selection criteria?

I have sent you a two page document; an overview from 11 states and a U.S. island that compiles their criteria.

Selection criteria should be data driven as it relates to our process. If we come up with criteria information from additional states that are different, we will bring that back to the committee so you can run that through your thought processes.

Front page: If there is not anything that stands out, do you have any questions about that listing? Are there thoughts you want to express? I will share a few thoughts that were sent in to us.

Michael Langford: Remember the re-entry population at this age group should not be overlooked. Many returning to the community have unaddressed binge and coping drinking issues. Re-entry from an incarceration standpoint.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: Access to treatment in the prison system is not available to everyone.

Terry Koons: Interested in districts covering all five regions of the state. Communities with strong coalitions but have a need to build infrastructure due to local resources. Having a way in the community to reach a diverse consumer base within the 18-25 population.

Ruth Satterfield: Will add to our list of things to think about. Open to committee regarding sample criteria.

Carlos Ramos: There are three that I believe should be kept in mind. I agree with data driven with high risk areas. On that list, address practices the county match would be that of experience that we are going to look at the diversity competent component. Those that can use support immediately and not for them to catch up with our criteria.

Mike Coyne: Couple of points. The goal for Ohio is to create statewide infrastructure baseline for consideration. The goal of covering the five regions may get us there. I will help you do that.

How do you blend those with high need with less infrastructure?

In terms of local community show what needs there might be, ways that you weight out things; so it will work out for communities that do not have coalitions. Really good plans for sustainability will make up for what is lacking.

Phil Atkins: I would have real bias, strong inclination, for emphasizing in the strategic plan about what we are about.

Give dollars to communities and coalitions who have demonstrated innovation to try this.

Infrastructure -- we can develop really novel approaches to these kinds of challenges. I don't think this is a place where we bring generally backward communities up to baseline.

Elaine Georgas: Do we know about DFCC in Ohio? There are coalitions that we don't have on our list; those whose funding has run out are no longer on the list.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: How do we balance that with those committed enough to continue in that vein but don't represent the new portrait or populations of Ohio who are stronger and willing to take it to the next level. We need to bring the other folks up that are not on our radar screen. People don't come to this high level of activity without support. Not just the highest of the organizations to the top, but across the state. So at the end of the day we need to bring all folks up to the level.

Michael Langford: It is very good to have coalitions that are already existing, however, they are the most difficult to work with. They have their own direction and it has been working just fine, and now we are saying you need to do it this way to get these funds. Sometimes they can be very difficult to work with and say we don't want the funds in the middle of the process. Some are very excited saying we can change. Bring the people to the table who are willing to go in this direction.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: We need to be consistent with the sharing across the process, so Ohio will not fall into the same position that one state has in the same cohort --of mistakes/lessons learned. Learn how this has been used in other places.

Cathy Sperling: What is the criteria for working with higher education, relationship with universities spread out over five regions. Are all the sites getting the same amount of money?

Ruth Satterfield: That answer is unknown at this time. The planning process in the beginning is not as expensive as on down the road.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: Can we ask other states how they worked that out. Coalitions work within their budgets and not what they actually need. Touch base with other states on how they rolled that out.

Phil Atkins: Can we do something creative? Could we do something like funding coalitions in pairs? Relational with a new coalition being paired with an existing successful coalition and have applicants be identified that they are going pair up.

Ruth Satterfield. Reaching out to another community--need to look at it. These are interesting things to explore how this will work.

Carlos Ramos: I like the idea. Also want to bring you back to your feedback from other states about working with coalitions similar to ours about how the regions are going to be defined. Have a meeting with those regions and present the framework and see how they can use the money. Are those regions really open to join this process that might create another level of complexity.

Ruth Satterfield: Comment very true from what I was hearing from the other states, some are very resistant to working too closely with the boards. Because this will be going through the boards, the boards will have to select the right coalition.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: If we frame the criteria right that will push the board into selecting the right coalition.

Elaine Georgas: The local governmental agency overseeing substance abuse in Ohio is the boards. On the focus of how they are doing the work and are working together with coalitions, the issue may come

to having the coalitions already funded to go in a certain direction. When we put this forward, we may not be going in the same direction that they are already doing. With what they are doing in one grant they may not be able to do in another grant.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: We need to set up our selection criteria to make the boards aware enough to make a really good selection.

Janet Groome: Readiness – we should have some level of baseline criteria for what we want.

Ruth Satterfield: There are tools to assess where the community's readiness is and what is needed to bring the communities to the level of capacity building.

Janet Groome: High readiness vs. very beginning groups. Are there readiness tools for targeting to communities with a very low readiness.

Sandy Starr: We are wrestling with these very things. Addressing disparity – we have to go about this in a balanced way to reflect the strength of the state as a whole.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: What real true building would we have done? How do we balance the responsibility of building coalitions; establishing them, and finding that balance?

Ruth Satterfield: We should also realize some year one money will carry over to year two to be spent in one year time period. It is possible we could utilize carryover to assist boards that do not receive sub-recipient grants to develop capacity.

Elaine Georgas: Looking at those communities, there may have been some communities that were not able to move forward. Can we look at them to see if there is support for them for four years or for one year? The focus was on evidence based. Building capacity potential to include some programming that is evidence based.

Ruth Satterfield: This grant is about planning with implementation at the end. This is a different level. We need to look at what our strengths are and there are some important things that we need to understand about the data, county level data.

Sandy Starr: What we have available at the county level in terms of consumption level is nothing. We have statewide level data; just not by county.

Go to county area on SEOW on those two page summaries of NSDUH, each county falls into a particular subset by specific consequence and county specific. Consumption equals lowest common denominator.

Every county is included in subset region. The most updated is 04-06, groups of 3 years of data. Consequence data - there is a big difference – most of it is up to 08; a lot more indicators by annual data rather than grouping 3 years of data.

We are looking at different years depending on consequence vs. consumption. Consequence is updated. New data are from Ohio Department of Health that we get from them.

Most of that is up on the web site today and some maybe going up very soon.

The problem with consequence data is that we had several agencies; some were overlapping, so we had some to disregard.

Kathie Chaffee: The University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute researches and publishes health indicators, by county, for every county in the country, (funded in part by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation). There are several indicators that are related directly to alcohol and other drugs; many are indirectly related. How the data is derived for each health indicator is included in the information.

Elaine Georgas: Ohio Health Survey--heavy drinking estimate risk factors are they the same?

Sandy: We are working on a survey and data that are unique to a particular county that we will add to the SEOW website catalogue with contacts. We are closing in on putting that out. Information is being reviewed internally before putting out.

Ruth Satterfield: The priority was selected knowing it is a challenge—the information is not easily available.

Elaine Georgas: Ohio Health Survey – heaving drinking estimate risk factors; will send Sandy that link.

Cathy Sperling: Not only not enough data but no business practice on how to deal with that geographical level – covering 5 regions.

Sandy Starr: Previously ODMH had those regions identified. ODMH are no longer using those. We are still working with those regions. Regions are divided by regional coordinator for technical assistance.

We have divided the grouping of counties into four: metropolitan areas, suburban areas, Appalachian areas, and rural areas because that is the one with the data behind it.

Cathy Sperling: With either four or five regions, should there be one in each region?

Angela Cornelius Dawson: If we are going to 4 regions, there could be 15 boards in one region.

Phil Atkins: Will the Association be in the loop at all? Things coming from the Association seem to go down a lot easier than from the Board.

Angela Cornelius Dawson: They have made sure that the actual decision maker is actually at the table rather than the group making the decision for them. Going in a regional area to make sure that all regions are covered is another way of looking at it.

Sandy Starr: With the infrastructure, there should be one in each region.

Ruth Satterfield: Geographical regions, it sounds like we are saying across the state. We will need a diversity scoring mechanism that recognizes these (referencing list on discussion handout). We need to have geographical regions covered and then we also need to think about diversity throughout the state.

Cathy Sperling: What is the data showing in that age group (18-25) and what is showing for AOD.

Sandy Starr: We anticipated that question. Nick is working on a spreadsheet summary that will prioritize where each of the data elements are falling mainly around the indicators that we have.

Cathy Sperling: Varied representation – you would want to have regional strengths. Everyone has the opinion that we don't forget the Northeast or Southeast regions, to see if there is any set pattern. Do you have any scoring sheets or templates? Maybe you could send those to us.

Ruth Satterfield: No decision has been made at this point. We are dealing with how we are going to set up the selection criteria.

Next Steps: Continue to send your pieces.

Closing Comments:

Ruth Satterfield: The next pieces to be sent to you are going to be meaty. Will send the draft of the minutes. PowerPoint from Tonia will be sent as well. Would it be helpful to receive a 4 region map and a 5 region map?

Sandy Starr will get copies of a 4 region map and the 5 region map.

Next Meeting:

May 28, 2010, the State Library (State Library Boardroom) from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. This meeting will be available through conference call. You can use the same directions as for today to make that conference call.

If you have any questions, email or call and we will try to answer those questions for you.